



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ary of 1599), nor Oudin (1607) and Victor (1609), give the German form *caranz* for the Spanish. The first mention of it is in Covarrubias (1611), where it is given as "palabra Tudesca," but with a Greek etymology; he gives correctly *autan* as "palabra Francesa," and mentions *beber de autan*.

LEO WIENER.

Harvard University.

CARADOS AND THE SERPENT.

THERE are four versions of the story of Carados and the serpent. Two of them exist in French and retain the name of Carados for their hero. They have been known as part of the Arthur cycle, but their relation to each other has not, I think, been discussed. The other two versions, which have not the name of Carados, have hitherto passed unnoticed in this connection. One is the ballad, *The Queen of Scotland*, which calls the hero, "Troy Muir." The other is a Highland tale given by Campbell, with the name of "Sheen Billy" for its hero. There is no doubt, however, that they represent the same story. My object in this paper is to bring together these four versions, and trace, so far as I can, their relation to each other.

The first version of the story is found in the first continuation of Chrétien's *Perceval le Gallois* (ed. Potvin, Vol. II pp. 191 ff.). As this part of the *Perceval* has never been rendered into English, I give here, for purposes of comparison with later versions of the story, a somewhat detailed abstract.

Carados is the son of the enchanter Eliaures and Ysaune, the wife of King Carados. When Carados is grown to manhood he meets his father in an adventure similar to that of Gawain and the Green Knight. He cuts off his father's head, and a year later presents himself to undergo the same test. But, after a trial of his courage, his father contents himself with telling him the story of his birth. Carados, in great indignation, informs King Carados. Ysaune is shut up in a tower, and young Carados travels in search of adventure. Recalled by the king, he discovers Eliaures in the tower with his mother. To avenge her disgrace, Ysaune appeals to Eliaures, who offers to punish Carados in this way: he will

create a horrible serpent and shut him up in her cupboard. When Carados visits her, she is to send him there immediately for her mirror. As soon as he puts in his hand, the serpent will wind about his arm. His flesh will then waste away, and in two years he will die. The mother agrees to this and carries out her part. The serpent winds about the arm of Carados, and his mother, Ysaune, then tells him that he has got what he deserves and that the best thing for him to do is to go forth and repent of his sins during the two years of life left to him.

Carados goes out into the forest and wanders about, seeking hermitages and religious foundations, everywhere confessing his sins. News of his trouble reaches his uncle, King Arthur. There is great grief in the court. Cadur of Cornwall is especially moved and takes an oath not to spend more than one night in a place until he has found Carados. He searches through many countries, until, one evening, he finds him in an abbey. He offers to kill the serpent, but Carados will not allow it, for that would cause his own death.

The next morning they start for Nantes together, but Cadur leaves his companion outside and enters the city alone. He makes his way to Queen Ysaune's tower. She faints at the sight of him. When she recovers, he reproaches her for her cruelty to her son. She admits that she is sorry, but she cannot undo what she has done. Cadur then asks if there is no possible cure. She promises to consult Eliaures.

That night, as usual, Eliaures comes to the tower, and Ysaune fulfills her promise. Eliaures tells her that he himself has no power to cure Carados, but that a cure is possible if there can be found a beautiful, well-born maiden who loves Carados loyally. She can cure him. She must prepare two caldrons and fill one with milk and the other with the sourest wine she can find. She must get into the caldron of milk and Carados must get into the caldron of wine. Then she must show her breast over the edge of the caldron and pray to God to cure Carados immediately. The serpent, disliking the wine and tempted by the sweet milk, will then leave Carados and seize her breast.

Cadur returns in the morning and learns what Eliaures has said. He then joins Cara-

dos again, and the two go to Cador's native land, where Cador's sister, Guinor by name, awaits them. She is a very beautiful maiden and she loves Carados. She is in a church, praying for him and for her brother, when Cador enters. She springs to greet him and asks news of Carados. Her brother asks her why she cares. She confesses her love. Her brother, much pleased, tells her how she can save the man she loves, and she consents to the ordeal.

The baths are made ready and Carados and Guinor enter them. Guinor calls on the serpent, in the name of Jesus, to leave Carados. The serpent will no longer endure the sour wine. He unwinds from the arm, and fastens upon the maiden. But Cador, who has been standing sword in hand, strikes on the edge of the caldron and cuts off part of his sister's breast. The serpent falls to the ground between the caldrons, and Cador cuts him in pieces. He then has his sister's wound looked to. Carados bathes, and remains with Cador and his sister until he, too, is cured. News then comes that King Carados has died and that Carados has inherited his kingdom. He promptly marries Guinor and has her crowned queen at Nantes. His arm, however, was never entirely healed, but always remained smaller than his other arm. He was therefore known as Carados Brisie Bras.

This, perhaps, is the end of the serpent story proper, but there is an epilogue to it. One day Carados goes out to hunt and follows a miraculous stag, which disappears, leaving him lost in the forest. He then sees a great light and hears the singing of birds. The light approaches and passes him. In the midst of it he sees a knight leading a maiden on a white mule. He accosts the knight, but receives no reply. He then follows him until he arrives at a castle. The knight there dismounts, greets Carados by name, and welcomes him as his guest. He has taken this way to secure an interview with Carados. His name is Alardin del Lac.

Carados is disarmed, clad in rich garments and led into the presence of the women. One of them, who is especially beautiful, embraces and kisses him, bidding him welcome. She seats him beside her and asks after Queen

Guinor and especially about her wounded breast. Carados declares his love for his wife. They talk for a while, then dine and sleep.

In the morning Carados prepares to return home. Alardin brings out a shield, the buckle of which has wonderful power. If a knight has lost half of his nose, a touch of this buckle will make a golden nose just like the one he had before. With other wounds it acts in the same way. Alardin offers the shield to Carados, who refuses it, but says he will gladly accept the buckle from it. Alardin tears off the buckle and gives it to him, with the remark that he knows how it will be used.

Carados, on his return home, goes immediately to his wife. He leads her into a room alone and applies the buckle to her breast. As soon as it touches her she has a breast of gold, in shape as it was before. Carados then tells her that no one must know the secret of her breast. He makes it a test of her chastity. He warns her, as an additional precaution, never to undress before women. For all his advice she thanks him.

Just after this, in the *Perceval*, comes the story of the wonderful horn, from which no man can drink without spilling, unless his wife has always been true to him. Carados alone is able to drink from it.

Potvin, in printing the *Perceval*, followed the Mons MS. In this part, however, the Montpellier MS. is fuller. It differs in some particulars and adds many details, some of which are given in Potvin's notes. To these it will be necessary to refer later.

The second version of Carados and the serpent is found in the *Roman de Renart le Contrefait*, written by the Clerk of Troyes. Two manuscripts of this exist. One manuscript is in Paris and is referred to as MS. A. The other MS. is in two volumes, the first of which is in Vienna, the second in Paris. It is known as MS. B. The two manuscripts stand in a somewhat curious relation to each other. They contain practically the same material, but the order of it has been changed freely, details have been added or omitted at will, and the wording has at times been exactly retained, and at other times, with no apparent reason for preference, it has been altered. There seems to be no doubt, however, that MS. B is a re-

working of MS. A by the author of MS. A, the Clerk of Troyes. Statements made in the text bear this out.¹ Certain dates are given, 1319 as the date when MS. A was begun, 1322 when it was finished, and 1328 when MS. B was begun. On B the author says that he worked thirteen years. It happens fortunately that we have the story of Carados as it is written in both manuscripts. Tarbé printed it from MS. A in his *Poètes de Champagne Antérieurs au siècle de François Ier*, Reims, 1851, p. 79-82, and F. Wolf printed it from the Vienna MS. in his *Le Roman de Renart le Contrefait*, Vienna, 1861, p. 8.

As given by Tarbé the story runs in this way:

To King Arthur was presented a cup, from which no man could drink if his wife had another lover. First the king tried, and then all the knights of his court, and they all failed, excepting Quarados, known as Quarados Brunbras, a knight of great fame. He kept himself in the forest a long time because of a serpent that remained on his arm for two years. He got it through his cruel mother. She sent him to her cupboard for her comb, and she had previously put the serpent there. Quarados unsuspectingly reached in and the serpent wound about his arm. There was no help for him, so he fled to the woods. He had a large mantle made and under it he always kept his arm. He lived in the woods and no one heard news of him. He grew very pale, for the serpent caused him great agony. There was a hermit to whom Quarados went every morning to hear mass. Often he prayed for death, for he had no longer blood nor flesh.

Meanwhile the maiden whom he loved, with her brother, was seeking him everywhere. Finally they came to the chapel of the hermit. They questioned him and he led them to Quarados. But Quarados, when he saw them, ran away. Nevertheless, the maiden called after him that she would never leave him until she had cured him,—that she would rather die than have him suffer. She stood beside him, naked to the waist, that the serpent might see

her. Her brother stood between them, sword in hand. "Serpent," she called, "look at me. See my white breasts. Leave that poor arm, that bone, and come to me." The serpent was about to throw himself on the maiden when the brother struck and cut the serpent in two, and then into more than ten pieces. They did not delay. Quickly afterward Quarados married the maiden. He was a guest at Arthur's court and he could drink from the cup without spilling. For this the other women hated his wife and spoke evil of her.

In MS. A this story fills one hundred and twelve lines; in MS. B it occupies but eighty-eight. It is nevertheless substantially the same. MS. B adds a reason for the mother's unnatural conduct, saying that she did it at the instigation of her lover, who wished to be revenged on her son because he would not allow sin to be committed. MS. B also omits the hermit's part in the story. But the wording of the two manuscripts remains the same even to the extent of whole lines and groups of lines.

There can be no question that the Clerk of Troyes derived his story from the *Perceval*. He gives a shortened and perhaps a rationalized version. He omits all of the introductory details concerning Ysaune and Eliaures; he omits most of the story of Cador and Guinor previous to the discovery of Carados; he omits the two baths, and, finally, he says nothing of the restoration of Guinor's breast.

The desire to shorten the story accounts for all the changes except the last two and may account for them. As the story is told in *Renart le Contrefait*, it is a parenthesis to the story of the magic horn or cup, and any degree of compression can be understood. Furthermore, in the *Perceval*, the restoration of the breast is told at great length, and as an independent story rather than as a pendant to the serpent story. The long introduction, containing the miraculous means of conducting Carados to the court of Alardin, is alone enough to separate it from what precedes. Its omission in an abstract of the serpent story, then, is not surprising. We should expect, however, the retention of the two baths, as they are a striking feature of the ceremony, and could be described in a few lines. The personal prejudice of the author, or the taste of a later

¹ *Le Roman de Renart le Contrefait*, (nach der Handschrift der K. K. Hofbibliothek, Nr. 2562, früher Hohendorf, Fol. 39) von Ferdinand Wolf, Wien, 1861.

Alexandre le Grand, par Paul Meyer, Paris, 1886, Tome II, 334-5.

generation, must account for their omission. Excepting the baths, all the salient points of the serpent story itself are retained in *Renart le Contrefait*. Further than that, there is nothing in *Renart le Contrefait* that is not covered by the *Perceval*.

We can even go a step beyond and say that the Renart version is derived from the Montpellier or from some allied manuscript, rather than from the Mons manuscript. It will be noticed that in the *Renart le Contrefait* Cador and his sister start together to search for Carados; while in the Mons MS. Cador goes alone. But in the Montpellier MS., as in the Renart, the two start together and actually arrive at the hermitage in which Carados is hidden. In the Montpellier MS. they do not find him in his hiding place, so they separate and Cador continues the search alone, as in the Mons MS. This second search, probably for the sake of brevity, is omitted in *Renart le Contrefait*, and the discovery of Carados ends what is, in the Montpellier MS., the first search.

Again, in *Renart le Contrefait*, an important part is played by the hermit, who is not mentioned at all in the Mons MS. In the Montpellier MS., however, he is prominent, although in a somewhat different way. The two lovers arrive at a church where the hermit carries on services for them and takes part in the process of freeing Carados. Given this, the use of the hermit in *Renart le Contrefait* to bridge over the omission of the details of Cador's search is very simple.

Finally, we have the actual words of the Montpellier MS. retained in *Renart le Contrefait* in the maiden's speech to the serpent. In the Mons MS. she says :

"Serpens, s'es-tu entendre ?
Lai Caradot, jel te comant
De par Jhésu le tout-poissant
Qui fist quanqu'il vot, sus et jus !"

In the Montpellier MS. her speech is :

"Esgarde, dist el, mes mamelles,
Com eles sont tendres et beles ;
Esgarde com blanche poitrine
Qu'est plus blanche que flor d'espine ;
Esgarde com ce vin est aigre,
La vie Carados est mège
Si que n'a mes en lui que prendre ;
Ne telai a celui sospendre,
Par toi d'ilec, tu feras sen.
Vien ça a moi, et si te pren ;

Ge te conjiur, diva, serpent,
De par le roi omnipotent
Du braz mon ami te despent
Ft à ma mamele te pent ;
Quar je sui moult et blanche et tendre ;
Bien te porras a moi entendre."

In MS. A of *Renart le Contrefait* the speech is this :

—Serpens, dist elle, esgarde moi ;
Et mes mamelles blanches voi,
Qui sont blanches, jeunes et tendre ;
Tu n'as en cel chétif que prendre :
Il n'a mès que le maigre os ;
Bien peuz veoir que tu es fos.
Vien toi à moi aerdre, et le laisse ;
Rien n'a mes en lui, qui te païsse.
Lais ses os ; prens ces blanchs choses.
Or m'est il avis que tu n'oses,"

MS. B of the Renart is shorter, but similar :

—Serpent—dist-elle—esgarde moy ;
Et mes blanches mamelles voy,
Qui sont belles, et la char tendre ;
Tu n'as en ce chetif que prendre.
Viens t'en prendre à moy et le laisse ;
Rien n'y a mais de quoy te païsse.
Laisse-le, preng ces belles choses.
Or me semble bien, que tu n'oses !—

Of these two last, the Montpellier rather than the Mons MS. is clearly the original.

We may conclude, then, that the story of Carados and the serpent in *Renart le Contrefait* is derived from the *Perceval*, and from the Montpellier rather from the Mons MS.

The third version of the story of Carados is found in a late English or Scotch ballad, *The Queen of Scotland*, No. 301 in Professor Child's collection.² It is my impression, from the language, that this is nothing but a late English imitation of a Scotch ballad; but it may possibly preserve fragments of an older ballad on the same subject. Professor Child advances no opinion, saying merely, "The insipid ballad may have been rhymed from some insipid tale."

Of the ballad's actual source we know nothing; but, whatever the source, the ballad undoubtedly preserves the kernel of the tale of Carados and the serpent. It begins with the Potiphar's wife story, so common as an introduction. Troy Muir, after refusing to gratify the queen's desire, is asked by her to lift a stone in the garden. Under the stone he will find a pit filled with red gold, enough to buy

² Vol. v, pp. 176-7.

him a dukedom. The next morning he lifts the stone, but instead of gold he finds a long starved serpent which winds about his middle. He exclaims that he must die by the serpent, but a beautiful maiden passes that way and cuts off her fair white pap to allay the serpent's rage. Troy Muir is immediately released. The maiden's wound is healed in an hour, and before the day has passed Troy Muir marries her. On the birth of her son she gets a new pap.

We have here the essential parts of the story. A woman, for revenge, sends a man to a place where a serpent is confined, that the serpent may wind about his body. A girl entices the serpent from the man by offering her breast as a dainty morsel. The man marries the girl who has saved him. In course of time her breast is restored.

Although the outline of the story remains, the details are lost. Not even the name of the hero is retained. This, however, is not surprising, when we remember that in *Renart le Contrefait*, which follows so closely after the *Perceval*, only one name is kept out of the many in the original.

The one important change in the ballad is the cause for the restoration of the breast. This is a folk-tale element which replaces the story of the miraculous buckle. Perhaps the best instance of it is found in the story of *William of the Tree*, given by Douglas Hyde in his collection, *Beside the Fire*. The king's daughter, in that story, has her hands and feet, which had been cut off by her father, suddenly restored on the birth of her children. It is a similar case.

The fourth version of the Carados story is found in Campbell's *Popular Tales of the West Highlands*, pp. xcv and xcvi of the introduction. A step-mother gave her step-son, Sheen Billy, a magic shirt which turned to a great snake about his neck. Then he was under spells and wandered about until he came to the house of a wise woman who had a beautiful daughter. This daughter fell in love with him and wanted him for her husband, though the wise woman warned her it would cost her much sorrow, her hair and her breast. But she cared not, so the wise woman helped her.

"A caldron was prepared and filled with plants; and the king's son was put into it, stripped to the magic shirt, and the girl was stripped to the waist. And the mother stood by with a great knife, which she gave to her daughter.

Then the king's son was put down in the caldron, and the great serpent, which appeared to be a shirt about his neck, changed into its own form, and sprang on the girl and fastened on her; and she cut away the hold, and the king's son was freed from the spells. Then they were married, and a golden breast was made for the lady."

This story was told to Campbell by "old MacDonald, travelling tinker." Other adventures followed which Campbell did not remember and which he was unable to get from the tinker's son. The story possessed no particular significance to him. He quoted it merely as having one scene which represented an incantation more vividly than anything else he knew. But the story is evidently the same as that in the *Perceval*, and as I shall point out presently, it contains elements not found in the two versions later than the *Perceval*. It is peculiarly unfortunate that the concluding adventures are lost, for if it could be established that they were identical with the following adventures in the *Perceval* we should have a most significant fact, which might throw some light on the troublesome questions of Gaelic Folk-Lore and the Celtic sources of *Perceval*.

As it is, we have something of importance, for the most noticeable thing about this Highland tale is that we have here retained two parts of the story that are found only in the *Perceval*. I refer to the bath in the caldron and to the golden breast. Instead of the two caldrons, we have but one, and that filled with plants, but it evidently corresponds to the caldron filled with sour wine. The other caldron has been introduced into the original story, or omitted from it, according as we accept the Gaelic or the French as representing the older form.

As the story is told by Campbell, the golden breast is mentioned but no details are given. Campbell ends abruptly, "And then they went through more adventures, which I do not well remember."

These two incidents, the caldron and the

golden breast, do not appear in *Renart le Contrefait* nor in the English ballad. They are peculiar to the *Perceval* and the Highland tale. They show conclusively, therefore, that these two versions stand to each other in some close relation, from which the other two versions, intermediary in time, may be excluded.

But no direct relation between the *Perceval* and the Highland tale can be established. When we pass beyond the two incidents that they have in common, we find, not only that the Highland tale is strongly Gaelic in coloring and expression, but that the details of the plot are widely different.

As for the Gaelic coloring, one may mention the game of shinny, the hen-wife, the magic shirt, and the wise woman, but when one undertakes to enumerate the divergences in the plot it becomes necessary to recapitulate the whole of both stories. Four points, however, may suffice for our present purpose. The step-mother is substituted for the mother; the snake is combined with a magic shirt; the girl has no previous acquaintance with the hero, and the part of the girl's brother is played by the wise woman, her mother.

These differences and the strong Gaelic coloring make it certain that the tale has had an independent existence for some years and is not recently derived from the *Perceval*. Indeed, circumstantial evidence shows that any recent use of the *Perceval* as a source is impossible, for the *Perceval* exists only in manuscript, and, since 1845, in Potvin's limited edition. When a special student of the subject like Campbell was ignorant of the contents of the French romance it is not probable that the Gaelic peasant was better informed.

It remains to be explained, then, how it happens that we find two versions of the same story in the French of the twelfth century and in Gaelic of the nineteenth, so like that we cannot deny some connection between them, so unlike that we know there can be no direct and recent connection.

There are two conjectural explanations. One is that the two stories come from a common source, the other that during the thirteenth, fourteenth or fifteenth century, the story spread from the *Perceval* until it reached the Scotch Highlands, where it was kept in circulation until this century.

Direct evidence cannot be brought to uphold either explanation, but there are two points which create a presumption in favor of the former. In the first place, we have clearly an old tale of magic, with adequate machinery for delivering the hero from the spell. There is no need for the divine interposition. The Christian element that we have in the *Perceval* is, without doubt, an interpolation, entirely unnecessary for the development of the action. The Highland tale, which is without the Christian element, is nearer the original form, and while it is possible that the Gaelic has returned to the original by the process of omission, it is more probable that it represents a form into which Christianity has never entered,—that is, a form independent of the *Perceval*.

The second argument in favor of the independent origin of the Highland tale springs from the position of the Carados story in the *Perceval*. It is there preceded, as has already been said, by the story which we have in English in *Gawain and the Green Knight*, and is followed by the story of the marvellous horn, which we have in the English ballad, *The Boy and the Mantle*. But the story of Gawain and the Green Knight as it exists in English is certainly not derived from *Perceval*, and the story in the *Boy and the Mantle* is also probably not from the *Perceval*. There is some reason to think in both cases that the origin is Celtic. This being so, it becomes even more probable that the Gaelic tale is an independent version of the intervening Carados story.

The outlines of the ballad story are so vague that it seems impossible to fix its relation to the other versions. But the fact that it mentions the restoration of the breast, even though it be in a different manner, shows a connection with the *Perceval* or with the Highland tale, and not with the *Renart*; and the fact that the girl has had no previous love for the hero and that she has no brother to help her, connects the ballad with the Highland tale rather than with the *Perceval*. The probabilities are that the ballad is a part of the same floating tradition that we have in the Highland tale and has no closer connection with the French.

This, then, is the most that we can conclude

concerning the four versions of Carados and the serpent. The version of *Renart le Contrefait*, of the first quarter of the fourteenth century, is derived directly from the *Perceval*, of the last half of the twelfth century, and from the Montpellier or some allied manuscript rather than from the Mons manuscript. The late English or Scotch ballad has only the merest outline of the story, but seems to belong with the Gaelic version that we have in a still later form, rather than with the French. And finally the Gaelic version, told in the first half of this century, may be an independent form of the story, or may be derived from the *Perceval*, but is certainly not derived from the English ballad or from *Renart le Contrefait*, and is certainly not recently derived from the *Perceval*.

No other form of the story has come to my notice, although, in pursuance of the hint given in Professor Child's "some insipid tale," I have carefully examined the chap-books and broadsheets in the Harvard Library. The steps of the story's progress cannot be traced.

An added significance is given to these four versions by the fact that the story as a whole is entirely unlike any other story. F. Wolf, it is true, thought that he saw here, and in *Der Arme Heinrich*, "eine gemeinsame traditionelle Grundlage." But I think this can hardly be maintained. The two central points in *Der Arme Heinrich* are: first, that a maiden is willing to sacrifice her life to cure the man she loves; and second, that, at the last moment, he refuses to allow the sacrifice, but is cured by his very denial. Now in the story of Carados I cannot see any indication that the maiden is to sacrifice her life. On the contrary, preparations to kill the serpent are made in the beginning. The breast is to be cut off, the serpent destroyed. The girl merely accepts mutilation, and the lover has no thought of preventing her.

I have not met with another instance of enchantment where the serpent is about the body of the person enchanted. There are innumerable cases where the person is turned into a serpent, as in *Libeaus Desconus* and in the three ballads, the *Laily Worm*, *Allison Gross* and *Kemp Owyne*. So also, in cases of retransformation, such as *Tam Lin*, one of the changes is almost always to the form of a ser-

pent. There are, too, many cases where the serpent is inside the body.

These last possess some interest in connection with the Carados story. The serpent inside the body is but another form of the hunger-demon story. This demon may take the form of any reptile. In its simpler forms the story is wide-spread and still persists. Children are still warned not to drink from brooks and springs, lest they get a little snake in their stomach, which will grow there and eat their food. Even so late as Feb. 23, 1898, the *Chicago Chronicle* published the account of a woman, who, according to her physician's statement, had a frog in her stomach. It was supposed that she swallowed a tadpole in spring water. There are innumerable similar cases given in the Folk-Lore Journals.

These stories connect with the Carados story in the devices used to free the person who is possessed by the hunger-demon. Invariably the appetite is appealed to. In the story of the *Alp Luachra* given by Douglas Hyde in *Beside the Fire*, the man was fed on salt beef and then made to lie with open mouth over a brook until the Alp Luachra and its twelve young came out to quench their thirst:

In Campbell's *Popular Tales*, vol. II, p. 366, a reptile called "lon craois" is tempted from a girl's stomach by the odor of roasting sheep.

But the most elaborate story of this kind is found in *The Vision of MacConglinne*, translated from the Irish by Kuno Meyer. Cathal MacFinguine ate apples on which spells had been laid and through the poison-spells little creatures were formed in his stomach and they came together and formed the demon of gluttony. MacConglinne cured him by making him fast thirty-six hours and then binding him and eating before him and describing foods and drinks before him until the demon came to the mouth of MacFinguine and was licking its lips outside his head. Then pieces of meat were held to the fire and then to the king's mouth. One of these the demon seized and carried to the fire. The caldron fell on him there. The property was removed and the house burned, but the demon was unharmed and escaped to a neighboring ridgepole. He was finally driven off by the power of the Christian religion.

In all such stories the serpent is tempted forth

by the offer of something that his appetite craves. He is then at the mercy of the bystanders. In the same way the serpent is enticed from Carados by the offer of the maiden's breast as a dainty morsel. This idea is prominent in all of the versions.

The bath in milk which occurs in the *Perceval* is there intended as an additional incentive to the serpent's appetite, just as the sour wine is meant to make his situation on Carados especially offensive. Milk is proverbially tempting to serpents. We have even the case of a serpent near Deerhurst in Gloucestershire which was gorged on milk until it was easily killed.³ But we may have something more than temptation to appetite in the two baths. Professor Child says, in his introduction to *Tam Lin* (*Ballads*, vol. III, P. 338):

"Immersion in a liquid, generally water, but sometimes milk, is a process requisite for passing from a non-human shape, produced by enchantment, back into the human, and also for returning from the human to a non-human state, whether produced by enchantment, or original."

There may have been formerly some such idea in the Carados baths.

The resemblances to other stories which I have been able to point out are not very striking, but they serve to show that the Carados story, although unconnected with other stories, is not apart from them. There is a popular element in it. Careful study reveals inconsistencies and incoherences even in the oldest and fullest version, the *Perceval* showing that we have a transmitted, not an original story. There is undoubtedly an older and simpler story behind it, and although in the *Perceval* it receives literary elaboration, it is certainly no literary invention.

We are left with two unsolved problems, the source of the story in the *Perceval*, and the connection between the *Perceval* story and the Highland tale. They are not unimportant. On the contrary, they form part of the greatest questions that occur in the study of mediæval literary history.

CARRIE A. HARPER.

Bryn Mawr College.

³ *A new History of Gloucestershire*, printed by Samuel Rudder, 1779, Quoted by E. Sidney Harland, in *The Legend of Perseus*, vol. iii, p. 54.

GOETHE'S HOMUNKULUS.

I.

UNTER diesem Titel hat A. Gerber in No. 2, Vol. xii (Februar, 1897) eine Abhandlung veröffentlicht, deren Doppelzweck die Zurückweisung meiner Auffassung dieses eigenartigen Wesens in Goethes Faustdichtung und die Darlegung seiner eigenen Auffassung der dichterischen Gestalt ist. Soll eine Diskussion über einen so schwierigen Gegenstand Aussicht auf Verständigung haben, so gilt es zunächst, sich über die Methode der Untersuchung zu verständigen. Auch Gerber geht von diesem Grundgedanken aus, findet sich aber auffälliger Weise so damit ab, dass er sich ausschliesslich an einen Aufsatz von mir im *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, Vol. xvi, S. 127-148, hält, der nur eine Ergänzung, eine Weiterführung der in meinem Buche *Goethes Faustdichtung in ihrer künstlerischen Einheit dargestellt* (Berlin: E. Felber, 1894) dargelegten Auffassung ist. Dieses Buch wird ausdrücklich *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, S. 130, angeführt, und im Anschluss daran heisst es: der Beweis "soll hier auf analytischem Wege angetreten werden"—"hier," in der Abhandlung des *Goethe-Jahrbuchs*. Diese darf also nur im Zusammenhang mit dem Buche selbst betrachtet werden, zu dem sie eine nach ganz bestimmter Seite gehende Ergänzung bildet und zu diesem Zwecke eine gerade hier gültige Methode verwendet. Gerber erwähnt dieses Buch mit keiner Silbe; er betrachtet die Abhandlung daher auch nicht als eine Ergänzung, sondern als eine selbständige, als ob die von ihm kritisierte Auffassung hier sich zum ersten und einzigen Male darstellte. Dadurch entzieht er sich und seinen Lesern die Möglichkeit das, was "hier" zu dem besondern Zwecke "analytisch" dargelegt wird, in seiner ursprünglich synthetischen Gestaltung zu betrachten. Es unterliegt nun aber keinem Zweifel, dass, wenn es sich um die Auffassung einer Einzelheit innerhalb einer grossen Dichtung handelt, die Frage, was die Einzelercheinung aus dem Zusammenhang für eine Beleuchtung gewinnt, die Hauptfrage ist, zu der ein aus besonderen Verhältnissen hinzukommender analytischer Beweis hinzutreten kann, aber nicht muss. Und gerade dieser Haupt Gesichtspunkt, der schon im Titel meines Buches klar und deutlich